



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/776,502

02/12/2004

Leopoldo Alarcon

60282.00112

3668

32294

7590

03/26/2008

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.

8000 TOWERS CRESCENT

14TH FLOOR

TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182-2700

EXAMINER

GONZALEZ, AMANCIO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/26/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/776,502	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ALARCON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> AMANCIO GONZALEZ	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 41-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 and 41-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 01/17/2008 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1, 3-23, 41, and 43-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhagwat et al. (US 6651105 B1), hereafter "Bhagwat," in view of de Gregorio et al. (US 20070127495 A1), hereafter "Gregorio."

Consider claim 1 as amended, Bhagwat discloses sending a message including information for identifying a first network access entity from a mobile entity to a second network access entity, wherein the message is configured to enable a connection of the mobile entity to be handed over from the first network access entity to the second network access entity, and wherein the message is configured to enable the second network entity to direct traffic destined to the first network entity (**see col. 8 lines 65-67, col. 9 lines 1-5, col. 10 lines 43-47**), but does not particularly refer to wherein a global address of the first network access entity is not known to the mobile entity. Gregorio teaches wherein a global address of the first network access entity is not known to the mobile entity (**see par. 0077**).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Bhagwat and have it include wherein a global address of the first network access entity is not known to the mobile entity, as taught by Gregorio, thereby providing means for the motivation of implementing Single Sign-On services for of users accessing a service network via Internet through a packet radio network, as discussed by Gregorio (**see par. 0001**).

Claims 14, 41, 45, and 49-54 address the same subject matter as claim 1, therefore same rejection applies.

Consider claims 2, 3, 19, and 20, Bhagwat as modified by Gregorio teaches claims 1 and 14 respectively, and Gregorio further teaches checking whether the address is globally routable (see Gregorio: par. 0077).

Consider claims 5-7, Bhagwat as modified by Gregorio teaches claims 1 and 14 respectively, and Bhagwat further teaches sending the message before establishing connection between the mobile entity and the first network access entity (see col. 8 lines 65-67, col. 9 lines 1-5).

Consider claims 8 and 22, Bhagwat as modified by Gregorio teaches claims 1 and 14 respectively, and Gregorio further teaches IP address mapping (see Gregorio: par. 0082).

Consider claims 9 and 43, Bhagwat as modified by Gregorio teaches claims 1 and 14 respectively, and Bhagwat further teaches an old network identity associated with the first network access entity (see Bhagwat: col. 10 lines 43-47).

Consider claims 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, and 18, Bhagwat as modified by Gregorio teaches claims 1 and 14 respectively, and Bhagwat further teaches proxy related functions (see Bhagwat: col. 5 lines 12-25).

Consider claims 21 and 47, Bhagwat as modified by Gregorio teaches claims 1 and 14 respectively, and Bhagwat further teaches handover functions (see Bhagwat: col. 3 lines 36-40, fig. 8).

Consider claims 12, 17, 23, 44, 46, and 48, Bhagwat as modified by Gregorio teaches claims 1 and 14 respectively, and Bhagwat further teaches identification functions (see Bhagwat: the abstract, col. 11 lines 34-37).

Art Unit: 2617

5. Claims 2 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claims 1, 3-23, 41, and 43-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhagwat et al. (US 6651105 B1), hereafter "Bhagwat," in view of de Gregorio et al. (US 20070127495 A1), hereafter "Gregorio," as applied to claims 1 and 41 respectively, further in view of Takusagawa et al. (US 20030225892 A1), hereafter "Takusagawa."

Consider claims 4 and 42, Bhagwat as modified by Gregorio teaches claims 1 and 41 respectively, but does not particularly refer to fast binding update. Takusagawa teaches fast binding update (see pars. 0110, 0111, and 0114).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Bhagwat as modified by Gregorio and have it include fast binding update, as taught by Takusagawa, thereby providing means for the motivation avoiding packet loss during a fast handoff in a mobile communication system, as discussed by Takusagawa (see pars. 0042-0048).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 and 41-54 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Amancio González, whose telephone number is (571) 270-1106. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah, can be reached at (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Art Unit: 2617

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

*Amancio González*  
AG/ag

/Charles N. Appiah/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617